

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE J		PAGE OF PAGES 1 13	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0004		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 12-Mar-2015		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. ACQR3838055		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC MID ATLANTIC PWD PHILADELPHIA 4921 S. BROAD STREET BLDG 1, 2ND FLOOR PHILADELPHIA PA 19112		CODE N40085		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N40085-15-R-7502	
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 29-Jan-2015	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) N40085-15-R-7502, Multiple Award Construction Contract (MACC) for New Construction, Renovation, Alteration and Repair Projects primarily in the state of Pennsylvania. Seed Project: Design-Build, Building 305 Exterior Insulated Metal Panels and Dual Fuel Furnaces, Naval Support Activity, Mechanicsburg, PA NOTE: THIS AMENDMENT MUST BE ACKNOWLEDGED WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 12-Mar-2015	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

AMENDMENT 0004

1. The date for receipt of proposal REMAINS 25 March 2015 at 3:00 PM.
2. **NOTE**: THIS AMENDMENT MUST BE ACKNOWLEDGED WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.
3. The solicitation is hereby amended as follows:

Specification Section 00100 – Bidding Schedule/ Instructions to Bidders, BASIS FOR AWARD, C. PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, **DELETE** previous editions and **REPLACE** with the following:

C. PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

1. The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. One performance confidence assessment rating is assigned for each offeror after evaluating the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements.

2. There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation. The first is to evaluate the offeror's past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection.

3. Past Performance relevancy will be rated as either "Relevant" or Not Relevant". The ability to complete both Design Build and Design Bid Build type projects for facilities renovation and construction projects meeting specified energy reduction goals and LEED certifications requirements. Relevant experience also includes, but is not limited to, completion of simultaneous projects in diverse geographic locations, projects in industrial, congested or urban areas with limited laydown areas, projects with significant phasing and coordination requirements, and projects involving historic buildings or in historic districts.

Table 4. Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	Definition
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

4. The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts. The past performance evaluation performed in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the offeror's past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts.

5. Performance Confidence Assessment. In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each offeror shall be assigned one of the ratings in Table 5 below:

Table 5. Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

4. The solicitation is hereby amended as follows:

Specification Section 00100 – Bidding Schedule/ Instructions to Bidders, BASIS FOR AWARD, E.
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD, **DELETE** previous editions and **REPLACE** with the following:

E. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

- The solicitation requires the evaluation of price and the following non-cost/price factors and subfactors set forth below. This will be a 2 Phase Evaluation process in accordance with FAR 36.3. Factors 1-3 will be evaluated in Phase I and Factors 4 and 5 will be evaluated in Phase II. Factor 1 will only be rated Acceptable or Unacceptable. If an Offeror is rated Unacceptable in Factor 1, then they will not be considered for Phase II. In making the best value award decision after Phase II, the government will consider Factors 2-5 and price. The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors is that technical factors are equal to each other and when combined are equal importance to the performance confidence assessment (past performance). The combined non-cost/price factors are approximately equal to price.

Phase I Technical Factors:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach

Factor 2 – Experience

Performance Confidence Assessment Rating

Factor 3 – Past Performance

Phase II Technical Factors:

Factor 4 – Safety

Factor 5 – Technical Solution

Price

2. Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor.

(a) General Submittal Requirements Technical Binder:

Offeror shall submit one (1), marked "Original", and three (3) copies, each in a separate three-ring binder with following characteristics:

- 8 ½ x 11 format
- 12 point font
- A cover page with Contract Number, Contract Title, Prime Contractor Name, Address, Phone Number, Fax Number, DUNS, Cage Code, Point of Contact and their phone and email address.

(b) General Submittal Requirements Price Binder:

Offeror shall submit one (1) marked "Original," and one (1) copy, each in a separate package with the following characteristics:

- 8 ½ x 11 format
- 12 point font
- A cover page with Contract Number, Contract Title, Prime Contractor Name, Address, Phone Number, Fax Number, DUNS, Cage Code, Point of Contact and their phone and email address.
- Completed SF 1442, including Pricing Schedule from Section 00010
- Proof of System for Award Management (SAM) Registry and ORCA registration

Phase- One Evaluation Factors

Factor 1, Technical Approach:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The composition and management of the firms proposed as the design-build (DB) team for this contract will be evaluated in this factor.

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

(1) Provide a narrative describing the proposed primary construction firms and primary design firms for this contract and the rationale for proposing this arrangement. Provide the role, responsibilities, and contractual relationships between the various firms (see FAR Subpart 9.6). The narrative shall also include a simple organizational chart that clearly identifies the lines of authority between the entities. If the experience of a significant subcontractor is being claimed in Factor 2, the firm must be named in the above narrative and organizational chart.

The technical approach narrative shall be limited to one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages) including the organizational chart. The information requested in item #2 below is not included in this page limitation.

(2) In addition to the narrative, the Offeror shall submit a signed copy of any joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, approved 8(a) Mentor-Protégé agreements, teaming agreement, or letter of commitment for each member of the Offeror's team identified above (e.g., joint venture partner, partner, team member, subcontractor, parent company, subsidiary, or other affiliated company, etc.).

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The assessment of the Offeror's technical approach will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. This factor will be rated on an Acceptable or Unacceptable basis. Offerors that are rated Unacceptable will be found ineligible to proceed to Phase II. All information outlined above in (a) (1) & (2) MUST be provided or the proposal will be considered UNACCEPTABLE.

Factor 2. Experience:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

(1) Construction Experience:

Submit a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of five (5) construction projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, cost, scope, and complexity to the RFP.

For purposes of evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as:

Size: A construction value of \$500,000 or greater.

Scope/Complexity: New building construction, interior/exterior alteration or renovations of facilities, repair projects that include repairs to multiple building systems, and/or demolition.

Submitted relevant project experience shall demonstrate the following:

- a. Experience as the Prime Contractor on all of the submitted projects.
- b. Both design-build and design-bid-build type projects.
- c. Both renovation and new construction of buildings. Projects submitted that only include horizontal or civil site work will not be considered relevant.

Proposals demonstrating the following experience on relevant projects will be considered more favorably:

- a. Experience with execution of projects simultaneously. In order for this experience to be "met", the Offeror must show projects with overlapping construction start and completion dates.
- b. Experience in projects with a construction cost of \$2,000,000 or greater.
- c. Experience on projects with emphasis on historic building preservation.
- d. Experience in executing projects in industrial, congested or urban area with limited laydown areas.
- e. Experience with projects involving significant coordination requirements.

Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole should not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors should submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment B) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. **(NOTE: Attachment B is not revised by issue of Amendment 0004. Refer to solicitation for Attachment B).** If the same project is being used to demonstrate construction and design experience, submit separate Project Data Sheets for construction and design. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Individual blocks on this form may be

expanded; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one double-sided page (or two single-sided pages).

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods). In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features. This requirement also applies to LEED "Sustainable Validated" projects (i.e. those not having U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) certificate). For projects which are registered USGBC LEED Certified, submit a copy of the LEED certificate.

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity. If the Joint Venture does not have shared experience, projects shall be submitted for each Joint Venture partner. Offerors who fail to submit experience for all Joint Venture partners may be rated lower. Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) projects combined.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. Under Factor 1, the Offer must provide a supporting joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, or letter of commitment and an explanation of the meaningful involvement for the design subcontractor for the project experience to be considered.

Experience of a proposed subcontractor will not be considered.

(2) Design Experience:

Submit a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of five (5) design projects for the design team that best demonstrates design experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP.

For purposes of evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as:

Size: A construction value of \$500,000 or greater.

Scope/Complexity: New building construction, interior/exterior alteration or renovations of facilities, repair projects that include repairs to multiple building systems, and/or demolition.

Submitted relevant project experience shall demonstrate the following:

- a. Both design-build and design-bid-build type projects.
- b. Both design of renovation and new construction of buildings. Projects submitted that only include horizontal or civil site work will not be considered relevant.
- c. Experience as the Designer of Record (Prime A&E) on a minimum of two (2) projects.

Proposals demonstrating the following experience on relevant projects will be considered more favorably:

- a. Experience with execution of projects simultaneously. In order for this experience to be "met", the Offeror must show projects with overlapping construction start and completion dates.
- b. Experience in design of projects with a construction cost of \$2,000,000 or greater.
- c. Experience with design on projects with emphasis on historic building preservation.
- d. Experience in executing projects in industrial, congested or urban area with limited laydown areas.
- e. Experience with projects involving significant coordination requirements.

Projects submitted shall be completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP. For design-build projects, the design portion of the contract shall have been completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

A project is defined as a complete design effort performed under a single task order or contract/subcontract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole should not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors should submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment B) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. . **(NOTE: Attachment B is not revised by issue of Amendment 0004. Refer to solicitation for Attachment B)**. If the same project is being used to demonstrate construction and design experience, submit separate Project Data Sheets for construction and design. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Individual blocks on this form may be expanded; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one double-sided page (or two single-sided pages).

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods). In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features. Clearly identify projects that are certified by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) LEED and the rating level. Also identify if the project is a LEED “Sustainable Validated” project (i.e. those that were not able to achieve LEED certification). If the project involved a historic building or a building in a historic district, the description should address features detailing how the work was completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. Under Factor 1, the Offer must provide a supporting joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, or letter of commitment and an explanation of the meaningful involvement for the design subcontractor for the project experience to be considered.

The Offeror may utilize experience of a design subcontractor to demonstrate design experience under this evaluation factor. Under Factor 1, the Offer must provide a supporting joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, or letter of commitment and an explanation of the meaningful involvement for the design subcontractor for the project experience to be considered.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror’s demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing relevant construction and design projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements. The assessment of the Offeror’s relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The Government will only review five construction projects and five design projects. Any projects submitted in excess of the five (5) for Construction Experience and five (5) for Design Experience will not be considered.

Relevant projects where the Offeror and the proposed design firm(s) have previously worked together may receive a higher rating than those that have not worked together.

Relevant projects that demonstrate design-build experience may receive a higher rating than those that do not have design-build experience.

Relevant projects that demonstrate experience with sustainable features may receive a higher rating than those that do not demonstrate experience with sustainable features.

Factor 3, Past Performance:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

If a completed CPARS, CCASS, or ACASS evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal. If there is not a completed CPARS/CCASS/ACASS Evaluation, the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) included in the solicitation is provided for the offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 2, Experience. An offeror shall not submit a PPQ when a completed CPARS/CCASS/ACASS is available. If a CPARS/CCASS/ACASS evaluation is not available, ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed PPQs should be submitted with your proposal. If the offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ (Attachment A), which will provide contact and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Linda Giallonardo, via email at linda.giallonardo@navy.mil prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs or CPARS/CCASS/ACASS previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation. PPQ are not included in the page count limit.

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 2 – Experience. Offerors may also address any adverse past performance issues. Explanations shall not exceed two (2) double-sided pages (or four (4) single-sided pages) in total.

The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. The Government's inability to contact any of the Offeror's references or the references unwillingness to provide the information requested may affect the Government's evaluation of this factor.

Performance award or additional information submitted will not be considered.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

This evaluation focuses on how well the Offeror performed on the relevant projects submitted under Factor 2- Experience and past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources. More emphasis will be placed on relevant projects. In addition to the above, the Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any and all sources including sources outside of the Government. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of contractors who are part of a partnership or joint venture identified in the Offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror.

The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, the source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the contractor's performance. This evaluation is separate and distinct from the Contracting Officer's responsibility determination. The assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be used as a means of evaluating the Offeror's probability to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP.

Offerors lacking relevant past performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance and will receive an Unknown Confidence Rating.

All information outlined above in (a) MUST be provided or the proposal will be considered UNACCEPTABLE.

Phase- Two Non-Cost/Price Factors:

Factor 4 Safety:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information: (For a partnership or joint venture, the following submittal requirements are required for each Contractor who is part of the partnership or joint venture; however, only one safety narrative is required. EMR and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors.)

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

For the three (3) (2012, 2013, and 2014) previous complete calendar years, submit your EMR (which compares your company's annual losses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over a three (3) year period). If you have no EMR, affirmatively state so and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the EMR and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate:

For the three (3) (2012, 2013, and 2014) previous complete calendar years, submit your OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If you cannot submit an OSHA DART Rate, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART Rate data and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach for Safety:

Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to evaluate safety performance of potential subcontractors, as a part of the selection process for all levels of subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety narrative shall be limited to two pages.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine that the Offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures for itself and its subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall safety record, the Offeror's plan to select and monitor subcontractors, any and innovative safety methods that the Offeror plans to implement for this procurement. The Government's sources of information for evaluating safety may include, but are not limited to, OSHA, NAVFAC's Enterprise Safety Applications Management System (eSAMS), and other related databases. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete safety information regarding these submittal requirements rests with the Offeror. The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety (Narrative)
- Other sources of information available to the Government

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

The Government will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate:

The Government will evaluate the OSHA DART Rate to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety:

The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovative methods to enhance a safe working environment may be given greater weight in the evaluation. NOTE: In the event the prime will perform all work with its in-house staff, that is NO subcontractors will be used at any level, provide this information in your narrative to document why the required information concerning subcontractors is not included in your proposal. Failure to provide the required information or an affirmative statement that the offeror shall perform all work itself without subcontractors will be considered a material defect rendering the proposal UNACCEPTABLE for this factor.

All information outlined above in (a) (1), (2) and (3) MUST be provided or the proposal will be considered UNACCEPTABLE. If information is not available in the submitted narratives, provide a reason for missing required information.

Factor 5 Technical Solution

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Provide a narrative describing the technical solution to the project and contract that meets the requirements of the RFP. Include the following:

For the overall contract, describe the Offeror's project management plan for delivering multiple projects within budget and time constraints, which outlines management approach and staffing resources available to the offeror to support the design and construction of the contract. Only for the purpose of project management plan narrative, the Offeror shall assume that at least two relevant design-build projects located at different sites within the PWD Pennsylvania Area of Responsibility are awarded to the Offeror at the same time and that the projects have the same project schedule.

For the seed project, provide a description of the technical solutions as they relate to the project requirements that demonstrate sound engineering practices, materials and principals, including low life cycle cost and durability in the development of the project. The narrative shall be organized by engineering disciplines required for this project and shall include but not be limited to:

- Provide a narrative explaining the construction process to be used to meet the scheduled date for the project's completion noting the building will remain operational during construction.
- Provide an explanation of the technical approach for the exterior renovations of the existing building to include asbestos and exterior finish and insulation system removal, repairs to deteriorated wood sheathing, personnel and overhead door removal, removal of lead base painted items and proper handling and disposal of all items.

- Provide an explanation of the technical approach for the preparation and installation of new insulated metal wall panels, new hollow metal frames and doors, new soffit, new downspouts and building signs.
- Provide an explanation of the technical approach for the removal of two oil fired warm air furnaces and replaced with two new similar warm air furnaces which are equipped with dual fuel burners for future use of natural gas.
- Provide an explanation of the technical approach for the implementation of the new DDC Direct Digital Control system that will control the new dual fuel warm air furnaces.
- Provide an approach for communicating with the occupants of the building for scheduling of work areas and building access.
- Provide knowledge of operational and weather constraints.

Narrative shall not exceed six double-sided pages (or 12 single-sided pages). Up to three conceptual drawings may be provided to supplement the narrative (i.e. floor plan, exterior elevation, and site plan).

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the narrative and conceptual drawings considering the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates a clear understanding of the architectural and engineering requirements of the project. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical solution to determine adherence to the technical requirements of the RFP.

4. In response to contractor questions, the following is provided:

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 1: Can you confirm the new maximum number of pages? Now are 83 single sided pages (75initial count+8 for the technical solution)?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 1: Refer to Amendment 0004. The maximum page requirement has been removed. Refer to each individual Evaluation Factor.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 2: Could you define execution of simultaneous projects in multiple locations in Pennsylvania? Shall we present evidence of occurrence of the projects with that one presented as part of the project presentation for evaluation?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 2: Refer to Amendment 0004, Factor 2, Experience, paragraph (1) Construction Experience and paragraph (2) Design Experience, "a. Experience with execution of projects simultaneously. In order for this experience to be "met", the Offeror must show projects with overlapping construction start and completion dates."

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 3: Does the simultaneous execution requirement count towards one of the presented projects only? Or should simultaneously projects be presented to evidence concurrent task orders?

GOVERNMENT QUESTION 3: Refer to Amendment 0004, Factor 2, Experience.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 4: In original solicitation page 11 paragraph 3 it is clearly stated that multiple IDIQ contracts still can't be presented as a project. However, amendment 2 now requires simultaneous projects in Pennsylvania. Can you confirm that IDIQ contracts still can't be presented multiple times?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 4: Refer to Amendment 0004, Factor 2, Experience.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 5: In Order for us to prepare a technical approach for removal of asbestos and lead based items will the government offer additional information regarding location, quantities and accessibility areas of concern?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 5: Refer to design/build specification, Small Project Part 3 Statement of Work/Project Program, page 2 of 16, paragraph 1. Project Description.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 6: Please specify the format and content that the government expects to be included in the 3 conceptual drawings?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 6: Refer to Amendment 0004, Factor 5, Technical Solution, “Up to three conceptual drawings **may** be required to supplement the narrative (i.e. floor plan, exterior elevation, and site plan)”.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 7: What is the size of the drawings that the government is expecting?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 7: Drawing shall be of sufficient size to be easily readable.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 8: What are the font size limitations for text and dimensions in conceptual drawings that the government expect to receive?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 8: Font for text and dimensions shall be of sufficient size to be easily readable.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 9: Can you provide information regarding the existing DDC system that the new DDC for the furnaces should tie in to?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 9: There is no existing DDC system in Building 305.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 10: Please provide a description of current methods used by the NAVY to disseminate information and the roles of the CO and COTR to disseminate information in order to prepare an accurate communication plan in our response.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 10: At time of award, information will be provided to successful offerors.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 11: What if during the pricing execution of the phase 2 more energy efficient concepts are developed that will modify the conceptual drawings presented in phase 1? Will the contractor be held to the conceptual solution for pricing?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 11: Refer to Amendment 0004, Government Response to question 6.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 12: Can you define what the government considers the “Pennsylvania area” for purpose of the simultaneous projects?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 12: Refer to Amendment 0004, Government Response to question 2.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 13: Is it possible to obtain the sign in sheet for the site visit? In addition, will better drawings/plans be available for the seed project?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 13: Sign-in Sheets from site visits shall not be provided as they contain Personally Identifiable Information (PII). At this time, there are no better drawings/plans available for the seed project.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 14: Knowing the seed project is 238 will all the projects on the MATCO be 238 or will there be 236 & 237? Can we bid the MATCO knowing that we cannot do the seed project?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 14: Bid in accordance with the solicitation and all amendments.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 15: Please clarify the NAICS Code under which the work for this MACC will be performed. The RFP states that the work under the MACC falls under NAICS **238120**, which is for Structural Steel and Precast Concrete Contractors. The MACC is for “New Construction, Renovation, Alteration and Repair Projects...,” which would fall under **236220**, Commercial and Institutional Building Construction. The seed project is for HVAC replacement, which would fall under **238220**, Plumbing, Heating, and Air Conditioning Contractors. It appears there was an error in the advertised NAICS of 238120.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 15: Refer to Specification Section 00600 – Representations & Certifications, FAR Clause 52.219-1, Small Business Program Representations (OCT 2014) – Alternate 1 (May 2014) for the applicable North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 238120 for the seed project.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 16: Will the maximum page limit for the entire submittal be extended to accommodate the addition of Factor 5 – Technical Solutions? Addendum No. 0002 added an entire section to the submittal, to include Conceptual Drawings; however, the page limit of 75 pages for the entire submittal was not extended to accommodate the stated 8-page maximum to add Factor 5 – Technical Solution.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 16: Refer to Amendment 0004, Government Response to Question 1.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 17: Could 11” x 17” pages be used for the requested Conceptual Drawings? To better accommodate the drawing clarity and legibility, please consider extending the RFP limits for paper size of 8.5” x 11” to include 11” x 17” for drawings.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 17: Refer to Amendment 0004, Government Response to Question 6. If conceptual drawings are submitted you may submit in 11” x 17” size. The size 11” x 17” **ONLY** applies to conceptual drawings if submitted.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 18: Please confirm that either a PPQ or CCASS is required for the five (5) design past performance projects submitted for the design firm identified in the offeror’s proposal?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 18: Refer to Amendment 0004, Factor 3, Past Performance.

CONTRACTOR QUESTION 19: If the design firms past performance project was a subcontractor to the prime offeror, would the prime’s CCASS report be sufficient for the design firm?

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE 19: Refer to Amendment 0004, Factor 3, Past Performance.

--END--

(End of Summary of Changes)